

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,5, 7-8, 10-11 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marley (7139556) in view over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273) and Siegel et al. (hereinafter Siegel) (US 2002/0143961).

Regarding **claim 1**, Marley teaches a method of exchanging user-specific data ("user's location", item F in Figure 2) from a mobile network to a service application of an external service provider ("ASP", item D in Figure 2), wherein certain user data is needed by the application for providing a requested service to a mobile user, the method comprising the following acts performed by a data control server of the mobile network (Figure 2):

receiving a service request form the mobile user directed to the service application (item A in Figure 1, Col. 1, lines 36-38)

generating a unique Application User Identification (AUID) random code which is assigned to a combination of the mobile user and the service application ("user tag", the user tag comprises identification of user and identification of service provider, ol. 3, lines 40-47; "**random multi-digit number**", Col. 4, lines 47-48)

sending the service request and the assigned AUID code ("user tag", Col. 3, line 42) to the service application ("**network N wishes to ask ASP1 for directions to or locations of the nearest pizza outlet**", Col. 2, lines 56-59),

receiving from the application a request for the user data of said mobile user ("**ASP will at step E request information about user's location from the network N**", Col. 4, lines 1-4),

allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if said assigned AUID code was included in the received user data request ("**ASP will at step E request information about user's location from the network N, using the user tag as a means of relating this request**" Col. 4, lines 1-4)

retrieving the requested user data based on the received AUID code and sending the user data to the application ("**the network responds to this request by providing the location of the user to ASP- that is by defining the geographical area in which the user is currently present. The network knows which user is concerned because it derives this information from the user tag**", Col. 4, lines 5-7).

Marley did not teach specifically code which is assigned when the mobile user has not previously assessed the service application and to obtain the user data in conjunction with any subsequent service request from the mobile station.

However, Lammi teaches in an analogous art a code which is assigned when the mobile user has not previously assessed the service application and to obtain the user data in conjunction with any subsequent service request from the mobile station ("**the user identifier and the corresponding anonymous identifier are eliminated from the**

data base after a predetermined time/(number of tries)", Page 5, lines 34-37 and Page 6, lines 1-4 and therefore the ID's has to be created if they don't exist). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the code which is assigned when the mobile user has not previously assessed the service application and to obtain the user data in conjunction with any subsequent service request from the mobile station in order to reduce the work load of the network.

The combinations of Marley and Lammi did teach specifically the method of checking in a permission table whether the service application is allowed to receive the requested user data, said permission table specifying a plurality of individual service applications and a type of data each individual application is allowed to receive and allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the service application is allowed to receive the user data according to the permission table. However, Siegel teaches in an analogous art the method of checking in a permission table whether the service application is allowed to receive the requested user data, said permission table specifying a plurality of individual service applications and a type of data each individual application is allowed to receive and allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the service application is allowed to receive the user data according to the permission table (Paragraph [0032-0033, 0035]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method of checking in a permission table whether the service application is allowed to receive the requested user data, said permission table specifying a plurality of individual service applications and a type of data each individual application is

allowed to receive and allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the service application is allowed to receive the user data according to the permission table in order to restrict access to private data.

Regarding **claim 2**, Marley teaches a method, wherein the AUID code is generated in response to receiving the service request from the mobile user (Col. 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding **claim 5**, Lammi further teaches the method, wherein the AUID code is used by the application for attributing the retrieved user data sent, to the said service upon subsequent access of the mobile user to the same service (Page 6, lines 1-4).

Regarding **claim 7**, Siegel teaches a method wherein a permission table is maintained for a specific user or group of users ("permissions can be specified in terms of groups", Paragraph [0021]).

Regarding **claim 8**, Siegel teaches a method, wherein an error message is sent to the service application if the service application is not allowed to retrieve the requested user data ("protocol describes getting and retrieving permissions as well as the specifications of what information is stored", Paragraph [0023, 0025]).

Regarding **claim 10**, Marley/Lammi further teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising determining whether a valid mobile user identity exists that corresponds to the received AUID code in order to check if the application is authorized (Marley: Col. 4, lines 8-9; Lammi: items 27-29 in Figure 2).

Claim 11, 18 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 16**, Lammi teaches a server according to claim 11, further comprising a mobile network interface for receiving service requests from mobile users, and for retrieving user data ("service gateway"; items 14 in Figure 1).

Regarding **claim 17**, Siegel teaches a method an external provider interface for receiving requests for user data from service applications, and for responding with either the requested data or **an appropriate error message** ("protocol describes getting and retrieving permissions as well as the specifications of what information is stored", Paragraph [0023,0025]).

Claims 3,4,13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marley (7139556) in view over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273), Siegel et al. (hereinafter Siegel) (US 2002/0143961) and further in view over Krishnamoorthy (US 2003/0115201).

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination of Marley, Lammi and Siegel teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity. However, Krishnamoorthy teaches in an analogous art wherein the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity (Paragraph [0042]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity. This modification is a design choice, since it is up to the data base manager to have all the information in one table or in

multiple tables from a single or multiple database located in a single or multiple devices.

Regarding **claim 4**, Lammi further teaches a method, wherein the mobile user identity is obtained from the translation table based on the received AUID code, for retrieving the requested user data from a user database in which user-specific data is stored for mobile users being registered in the mobile network (Abstract; "identification database"; item 13 in Figure 1).

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 3.

Regarding **claim 14**, Lammi teaches a server further comprising a translator for translating AUID codes into mobile user identities and vice versa by checking the translation table (Page. 8, lines 13-20; Page. 9, lines 5-10).

Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marley (7139556) in view over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273), Siegel et al. (hereinafter Siegel) (US 2002/0143961) and Chung (US 2003/0016823).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Marley, Lammi and Siegel teaches all the particulars of the claim except a method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code. However, Chung teaches in an analogous art, a method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code (Abstract; Figure 4, Paragraphs

[0016-18]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code. This modification is useful for providing secure (cryptographic applications) communication.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Moreley does not check whether the ASP is authorized to receive the requested location information.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Siegel teaches (Paragraphs [0032-0033]) whether the APS is authorized to receive user related information.

Applicant argues that the claimed feature of assigning an AUID code to a combination of the user and the service application when the user has not previously used the service application is not taught or suggested by Marley/Lammi combination.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Marley teaches the claimed feature of assigning an AUID code to a combination of the user and the service application (user tag in col. 3, lines 40-47 is a combination of an identification of the user and the service application) and is being generated in response to the user's request.

Lammi further teaches that the identifier's are eliminated from the database after a predetermined time/inquiries. Therefore, the identifier is being used for predetermined number of time or inquiries.

Therefore, the identifier stored in the database is being used if it already exists and is being used for a predetermined number of time/inquiries and generated new if it does not exist.

In view of the above the combination of Marley and Lammi teaches the limitation cited above.

Applicant argues the claimed feature of allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the AUID code was included in the request and if the service application is allowed according to the permission table cannot reasonably be derived from any properly combination of the applied documents.

Marley teaches the claimed feature of allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if the AUID code was included in the request (the APS request information about the user's location from the network using the user tag, Col. 4, lines 1-4). Siegel teaches if the service application is allowed according to the permission table (permission table, paragraph [0032]).

In view of the above the combination of Marley and Lammi teaches the limitation cited above.

Applicant argues that what is alleged in Siegel to be a permission table exists in a different context than that of Applicant's independent claims. Moreover, none of the applied references are directed to the problem solved by Applicant's (of protecting user data), but rather protecting the user's identity.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The permission table provides information regarding where the particular ID has permission access user data (Siegel, Paragraph [0033]). User's identity is also user data.

In view of the above the combination of Marley and Lammi teaches the limitation cited above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUTHUSWAMY G. MANOHARAN whose telephone number is (571)272-5515. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-2:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eng George can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick N. Edouard/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617